

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 8, and 18 have been amended.

Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-20 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION

According to the Office Action, the disclosure is objected to because of an informality on page 4, line 30. Herein, the disclosure has been amended to correct the informality on page 4, line 30.

Also, the Office Action states that the title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Herein, the title has been amended.

35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-4, 8-11, and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Musk, U.S. Patent No. 5,577,146 (hereafter Musk). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites:

An optical fiber receptacle adaptor comprising:
a single-part housing comprising a receptacle end and a port end,
the ***receptacle end adapted*** for securing to an optical fiber receptacle
and ***for inserting therein and receiving an optical ferrule receiving***
portion of the optical fiber receptacle, and
the ***port end adapted for inserting therein and receiving an optical***
ferrule and for urging the optical ferrule into communication with the
optical ferrule receiving portion of the optical fiber receptacle.
(emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that Musk does not disclose the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitations, "***a single-part housing comprising a receptacle end and a port end,***" (emphasis added), "***receptacle end adapted . . . for inserting therein and receiving an optical ferrule receiving portion,***" (emphasis added), and "***port end adapted for inserting therein and receiving an optical ferrule,***" (emphasis added). In contrast, Musk discloses an optical connector comprising a plug 1 and an associated receptacle 2 having a rectangular housing 3, wherein the housing 3 is of a slit type, and has two injection-molded housing halves 3a and 3b. [Musk; Figures 1-2; Col. 3, lines 48-58]. That is, the housing 3 of Musk has part 3a and part 3b instead of being a single-part housing as in Independent Claim 1.

Further, the housing 3 has a rectangular opening 4 at one end while the housing halves 3a and 3b grip the rear end portion (or the cylindrical housing 16) of an active component 5 between them at an opposite end relative to the rectangular opening 4. [Musk; Figures 1-2; Col. 3, lines 48-58]. The ferrule 18 of the plug 1 is inserted into the rectangular opening 4 of the housing 3 to couple with the ferrule receiving portion 13 (or sleeve 13) of the active component 5, wherein the housing halves 3a and 3b are brought together to enclose the ferrule receiving portion 13 (or sleeve 13) of the active component 5 inside the housing 3. [Musk; Figures 1-2; Col. 4, lines 5-41; Col. 5, lines 19-32]. That is, the housing 3 of Musk has the rectangular opening 4 for inserting therein the ferrule 18 and an opposite end for gripping the rear end portion (or the cylindrical housing 16) of an active component 5 instead of having a receptacle end adapted for inserting therein and receiving an optical ferrule receiving portion and a port end adapted for inserting therein and receiving an optical ferrule, as in Independent Claim 1.

Although the Office Action cites element 40 as being the optical fiber receptacle adaptor, Musk clearly describes element 40 as being a module housing 40 containing a circuit board 41 incorporating an electric circuit for converting the electrical signal output of the an optical receiving device into an electrical output signal, wherein the module housing 40 fails to have a receptacle end and a port end as recited in Independent Claim 1. [Musk; Figure 7; Col. 6,

line 5-18]. As described above, Musk does not disclose the cited claim limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Musk and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-4 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over Musk. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-4 are patentable over Musk for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 8 and 18, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 8 and 18 recite similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, the Independent Claim 8 recites the limitation, “an optical fiber receptacle adaptor having ***a single-part housing comprising a receptacle end and a port end***, the ***receptacle end adapted*** for securing to the optical fiber receptacle and ***for inserting therein and receiving the optical ferrule receiving portion*** of the optical fiber receptacle, and the ***port end adapted for inserting therein and receiving an optical ferrule*** and for urging the optical ferrule into communication with the optical ferrule receiving portion of the optical fiber receptacle,” (emphasis added). Further, the Independent Claim 18 recites the limitation, “***inserting*** an optical fiber receptacle ***into an receptacle opening at a receptacle end*** of an optical fiber receptacle adaptor ***having a single-part housing comprising said receptacle end***,” (emphasis added). As described

above, Musk does not disclose the cited claim limitations of Independent Claims 8 and 18. Therefore, Independent Claims 8 and 18 are not anticipated by Musk and are in condition for allowance for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 9-11 and 15-17, and Dependent Claims 19-20 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 8 and 18 respectively, which are allowable over Musk. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 9-11, 15-17, and 19-20 are patentable over Musk for the reasons discussed above.

35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 5-7 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Musk, U.S. Patent No. 5,577,146 (hereafter Musk). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 5-7 and Dependent Claim 12-14 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1 and 8 respectively, which are allowable over Musk. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 5-7 and 12-14 are patentable over Musk for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments and remarks overcome all rejections and objections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-20) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-20) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 6/16/05



James P. Hao
Registration No. 36,398

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060